REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the application. Claims 7-13, 17, 18, 22-26 and 35 are allowed.

Claims 1-6, 14-16, 19, 20 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,318,545 (Ross II). Claims 21, 27, 28, 30 and 33 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,275,808 (Wentz). Claims 29, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,580,638 (Benbow).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6, 14-16, 19-21 and 27-34 is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to characterize the roller support system as comprising at least one wall with an axial extent parallel to the rotational axis for the first roller. The one opening is characterized as having a width transverse to the length of the opening that is substantially uniform and continuous over a substantial portion of the axial extent of the one wall.

Ross II does not teach or suggest any corresponding elongate opening.

Claims 2, 3, 14-16, 19, 20 and 34 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 4 has been amended to characterize the first axis as that about which the first roller rotates.

The allegedly corresponding blade in Ross II is not intended to, nor can it, rotate above an axis parallel to the rotational axis for the allegedly corresponding roller in Ross II.

Claims 5 and 6 depend cognately from claim 4 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 21 has been amended to characterize the conveying belt as having oppositely facing first and second surfaces, with the first surface supporting objects/materials to be conveyed by the conveyor system. The first blade is characterized as bearing against the first surface on the conveying belt in addition to the first roller.

Wentz teaches only a single component that acts against a roller and a surface of the conveying belt that is opposite to that which effects conveyance. Accordingly, Wentz does not meet the limitations of claim 21, nor does Wentz make the structure recited in claim 21 obvious. Complete redesign of Wentz would be required to meet claim 21. The motivation to do so would exist only if one reviewed applicant's disclosure.

Claim 27 depends from claim 21 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 28 recites a cleaning blade with first and second portions thereof defined as one piece to engage a roller and conveying surface of a conveying belt.

As noted with respect to claim 21, Wentz does not teach or suggest any corresponding blade to engage a conveying surface on a conveying belt.

Claims 30 and 33 each depends from claim 28 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 29 has been amended to characterize the cleaning blade therein as having a second portion for engaging the conveying surface on the associated conveying belt.

Benbow's allegedly corresponding second portion engages the surface of the conveying belt facing oppositely to the conveying surface thereon. Thus, Benbow does not teach the structure in claim 29, nor would the same be obvious from Benbow.

Claim 31 has been amended to characterize the second portion of the cleaning blade as engaging the conveying surface on the conveying belt with which the cleaning blade is associated. As noted above with respect to claim 29, Benbow does not teach or suggest such a structure.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6, 14-16, 19-21 and 27-34 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: July 12, 2005